



# METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

## MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

The following is the Agenda for a meeting of the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to be held **August 12, 2015 at 1:00 p.m.** in the **Las Cruces Council Chambers, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.** Meeting packets are available on the [Mesilla Valley MPO website](#).

The Mesilla Valley MPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The Mesilla Valley MPO will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this public meeting. Please notify the Mesilla Valley MPO at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers listed above. *Este documento está disponible en español llamando al teléfono de la Organización de Planificación Metropolitana del Valle de Mesilla: 528-3043 (Voz) o 1-800-659-8331 (TTY).*

1. **CALL TO ORDER** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
2. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
3. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA\*** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
5. **\* APPROVAL OF MINUTES** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5.1. \*June 10, 2015 \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
6. **ACTION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 6.1. Resolution 15-09: A Resolution Amending the 2014-2019 Transportation Improvement Program \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS** \_\_\_\_\_
  - 7.1. NMDOT update \_\_\_\_\_ **NMDOT Staff**
  - 7.2. Committee Training (Taylor Road Functional Classification) \_\_\_\_\_ **MPO Staff**
8. **COMMITTEE and STAFF COMMENTS** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
9. **PUBLIC COMMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**
10. **ADJOURNMENT** \_\_\_\_\_ **Chair**

1                   **MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
2   **POLICY COMMITTEE**  
3

4 The following are minutes for the meeting of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning  
5 Organization (MPO) Policy Committee which was held June 10, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. in  
6 Commission Chambers at Dona Ana County Government Building, 845 Motel Blvd., Las  
7 Cruces, New Mexico.  
8

9 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**     Commissioner Billy Garrett (DAC)  
10                                   Commissioner Leticia Benavidez (DAC)  
11                                   Trent Doolittle (NMDOT)  
12                                   Trustee Linda Flores (Town of Mesilla) arrived 1:27  
13                                   Councillor Olga Pedroza (CLC) departed 1:32  
14                                   Mayor Nora Barraza (Town of Mesilla) arrived 1:11  
15                                   Councillor Gill Sorg (CLC) departed 1:32  
16                                   Councillor Nathan Small (CLC) arrived 1:08, departed 1:53  
17

18 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**     Trustee Sam Bernal (Town of Mesilla)  
19                                   Commissioner Wayne Hancock (DAC)  
20

21 **STAFF PRESENT:**       Tom Murphy (MPO staff)  
22                                   Andrew Wray (MPO staff)  
23                                   Michael McAdams (MPO staff)  
24                                   Sharon Nebbia (MPO staff)  
25

26 **OTHERS PRESENT:**     Jolene Herrera (NMDOT)  
27                                   Chris Mydock (NMDPS)  
28                                   Becky Baum, RC Creations, LLC, Recording Secretary  
29

30 **1.     CALL TO ORDER (1:05 p.m.)**  
31

32 Flores:           its five minutes after one so I'm going to go ahead and call this meeting to  
33                   order. Do we need to have a roll call?  
34

35 Wray:            Yes.  
36

37 Flores:           Okay.  
38

39 Wray:            Councilor Pedroza.  
40

41 Pedroza:         Here.  
42

43 Wray:            Mr. Doolittle.  
44

45 Doolittle:        Here.  
46

1 Wray: Councilor Sorg.  
2  
3 Sorg: Here.  
4  
5 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.  
6  
7 Garrett: Here.  
8  
9 Wray: Madam Chair.  
10  
11 Flores: Okay, so, here. And we have a quorum. Okay so we have a quorum.  
12  
13 Wray: Yes. Sorry.  
14

15 **2. CONFLICT OF INTEREST INQUIRY**

16 **Does any Committee Member have any known or perceived conflict of**  
17 **interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee Member may**  
18 **recuse themselves from voting on a specific matter, or if they feel that they**  
19 **can be impartial, we will put their participation up to a vote by the rest of**  
20 **the Committee.**

21  
22 Flores: Conflict of interest inquiry.  
23  
24 Wray: A noise distracted me.  
25  
26 Flores: Okay. Does any Committee member have any known or perceived  
27 conflict of interest with any item on the agenda? If so, that Committee  
28 member may recuse themselves from voting on any specific matter, or if  
29 they feel that they can be impartial we will put their participation up to a  
30 vote by the rest of the committee.  
31

32 NO CONFLICT.

33  
34 Flores: Okay.  
35

36 **3. PUBLIC COMMENT – No public comment**

37  
38 **4. CONSENT AGENDA \***

39  
40 Flores: So we'll move on to the Consent Agenda. Do I have a motion?  
41  
42 Garrett: So moved.  
43  
44 Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett has moved to approve the Consent Agenda.  
45  
46 Pedroza: Second.

1  
2 Sorg: I'll...  
3  
4 Flores: There was a second by both Olga Pedroza and, and, and Gill Sorg but  
5 we'll go ahead and go with Councilor Pedroza. She was first. Okay.  
6  
7 Wray: Oh, Madam Chair.  
8  
9 Flores: Yes.  
10  
11 Wray: We've skipped over a public comment.  
12  
13 Flores: Oh. I'm sorry. I did and, and there's actually somebody in the public that  
14 wants to comment. So, sorry, so moving back to public comment. Is  
15 there anyone from the public that would like to come up and please do,  
16 please come forward and state your name for the record? And welcome.  
17  
18 Thurston: Thank you. My name is Ken Thurston and I wanted to appear before the  
19 MPO today to ask for a change in the MPO Road Specifications as it  
20 relates to Taylor Road from Elks to El Camino and Lopez Road from Elks,  
21 it's to El Camino also. And not knowing exactly how to approach this  
22 organization we decided to show up today and see if we could have public  
23 input on those two items.  
24  
25 Flores: Okay.  
26  
27 Thurston: We own the land, approximately 158 acres. We are trying to do the  
28 development. We have met with the City and the County staff and we're  
29 basically being told that the process we need to meet before the MPO and  
30 present our case and ask for the variance or a change of road definition in,  
31 on those two roads relating to our property.  
32  
33 Flores: Oh, so you need to ask for a variance or a change in the definition...  
34  
35 Murphy: Correct.  
36  
37 Flores: Of the road.  
38  
39 Thurston: And then we can take this to the ETZ and you know go through and meet  
40 the requirements, but without a change on those two roads they're just  
41 telling us that, "Look this is the way it is and this is the way it's going to  
42 be." And we do not agree with the right-of-way or the, because of the  
43 housing situation to the west and to the east, we are saying that that's not  
44 logical and so we're asking to be heard here and ask for that variance.  
45  
46 Sorg: Madam Chair.

1  
2 Flores: Yes.  
3  
4 Sorg: I, thank you Madam Chair. I have a little history with this. I, I'm aware of  
5 what's going on. I think it would be helpful for the, the Policy Committee to  
6 get a little history of this particular road, why it was designated as it was  
7 and, and then we could make a better decision as to what to do here.  
8  
9 Flores: Okay.  
10  
11 Pedroza: Madam Chair.  
12  
13 Garrett: Madam Chair.  
14  
15 Flores: Actually first let me just say I don't think we're going to make any decision  
16 today. I just wanted to hear what he had to say and maybe make a  
17 decision on whether we want to invite him back and put him on the  
18 agenda or if we'll decide that maybe Mr. Murphy can help him out and  
19 there's a Plan B, but go ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt you ...  
20  
21 Garrett: That was what I was going to suggest, Madam Chair.  
22  
23 Flores: Okay.  
24  
25 Pedroza: Madam Chair.  
26  
27 Flores: Yes Councilor Pedroza.  
28  
29 Pedroza: I, I, I'm totally in agreement with that but I would also like to know exactly  
30 to, what kind of change it is that you're requesting and why, either now or  
31 when, when it's scheduled to be heard.  
32  
33 Thurston: Is there a way to pull up the actual designation currently?  
34  
35 Garrett: Madam Chair.  
36  
37 Flores: Commissioner Garrett.  
38  
39 Garrett: It'd be helpful if we could also get the description of the, the specific roads  
40 again.  
41  
42 Flores: Okay, of which roads that he wants to have changed from what, from what  
43 points...  
44  
45 Thurston: Okay.  
46

1 Flores: Is that what you're asking? Okay. If you could repeat the, what you want  
2 to have altered and that...  
3  
4 Thurston: Okay. I'm assuming you're seeing what I'm seeing...  
5  
6 Flores: Yes. We all have computers with it.  
7  
8 Thurston: On your screen here. So if you look on the Taylor Road where it crosses  
9 El Camino Real and goes east to Elks and then Lopez where it goes from  
10 El Camino up to Zertuche to Elks. Those are the two roads. Several  
11 years ago the County asked for the right-of-way on Taylor Road. At the  
12 time they wanted a 60-foot right-of-way and that's what they received and  
13 then the road was put in to make the connection and now they're, you're,  
14 the MPO is requiring it to be I think an 80, no they want that one to be  
15 100-foot and Lopez to be 85-foot. We are asking for a 60-foot to stay the  
16 same on Taylor and Lopez to stay, or to be required at a 60-foot and that's  
17 why we're here today. And I agree with the two inputs. We just need to  
18 know how to get before the Board and then what the process is and if  
19 you're going to tell me to take this back through Tom, I'm glad to do that  
20 and then come before the August meeting.  
21  
22 Flores: Right. Commissioner Garrett.  
23  
24 Garrett: Thank you Madam Chair and, and I think it would be helpful also to have  
25 whatever input we need from the County staff and, and any other relevant,  
26 I mean because it would be posted as an item for discussion or potentially  
27 for action, we need to make sure that other relevant parties are, are also  
28 informed.  
29  
30 Flores: Okay.  
31  
32 Thurston: I agree.  
33  
34 Flores: So are we deciding to go ahead and put this on the agenda and have  
35 more information for discussion and then we can put it as an action item if  
36 we decide to choose from that point?  
37  
38 Murphy: Madam Chair, we can do that. I would also, I'd also recommend that we  
39 do take it through at least the Technical Advisory Committee so that, that,  
40 that's, that's really our point of contact with County staff, with City staff,  
41 DOT staff, and then...  
42  
43 Flores: And...  
44  
45 Murphy: They, they're an advisory committee to, to this body as you know. I would  
46 take it to their August meeting prior to your, to your August meeting.

1  
2 Flores: That, that was my question. Do they have a July meeting or do they also  
3 not have a, okay. All right. And they're, they meet prior to us.  
4  
5 Murphy: Yes they do. They meet, meet the first Thursday of each month.  
6  
7 Flores: And at this point can you...  
8  
9 Murphy: Except for July.  
10  
11 Flores: Say that their agenda is full or that they would have room to put, add this  
12 to the agenda?  
13  
14 Murphy: We have room for it.  
15  
16 Flores: Okay. All right. So, and are you going to allow him to come to that  
17 meeting then and give him the time so that he'll, Mr. ...  
18  
19 Murphy: Absolutely. It's an open public meeting.  
20  
21 Flores: Okay. All right. Thank you.  
22  
23 Thurston: Thank you.  
24  
25 Flores: Commissioner Garrett.  
26  
27 Garrett: Madam Chair. I just, I just want to make sure, do we have any precedent  
28 in terms of, of dealing with this kind of request before? Is there a specific  
29 process that we should be following?  
30  
31 Murphy: There, there are a couple ways of, of doing, of, of achieving what Mr.  
32 Thurston is asking for. One, and, and what I believe his request today is  
33 to amend the, the Transportation Plan to show that those particular  
34 roadways have different right-of-ways. Two, and this, this will go, this  
35 would go through the, the EDRC is to request a waiver to those, to those  
36 standards. MPO staff has met with Mr. Thurston and, and we advised him  
37 that you know under certain conditions we would support his request of  
38 the waiver if he were to go through that process and, and MPO staff is a  
39 voting member on the EDRC Committee. Although I, also I think  
40 conditionally though I think with the, I'll have to check procedures but I  
41 think the EDRC Committee recommendation has to be ratified by the  
42 Planning and Zoning Committee for, for that particular jurisdiction being  
43 the ETA. But there are two ways of achieving that and we had, it, I, I do  
44 not know if he's pursuing the second one but the, the latter one which  
45 goes through this body is certainly something we can schedule and, and

1 hear through if for any reason he, he's, fails in the, in the waiver process  
2 through the EDRC.  
3

4 Garrett: Okay. Madam Chair I, I think it's important that if this is going to come  
5 through to the, the MPO Policy Committee that we have full, as much  
6 background as we can in terms of why the current designation is the way  
7 that it is and then what the implications are of making the change in, in  
8 terms of what the standards are and what the rationale for the standards  
9 are so that we actually, we've got a couple of months so it'd be good to  
10 have that as a whole package for consideration when it eventually gets to  
11 us in, in August.  
12

13 Flores: Absolutely, I mean I, one of our problems in Mesilla is University, we don't  
14 have enough room on University and it's causing all sorts of problems with  
15 our school area and so, definitely. Yes. Councilor Sorg.  
16

17 Sorg: If Commissioner Garrett is finished, I just have a couple questions on this  
18 one. We're talking about the difference between an arterial and a  
19 collector, are we not?  
20

21 Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Sorg. I think we can, and we certainly could  
22 entertain anyway, anywhere from a, you know dropping them down to a  
23 local through keeping you know an arterial. As you see on the, on the  
24 screen Taylor is a minor arterial and Lopez is designated as a collector.  
25 Per the County Design Standards, the minor arterials require 100 feet of  
26 right-of-way.  
27

28 Sorg: Okay.  
29

30 Murphy: And collectors require 85 feet of right-of-way but again as I stated there is  
31 a, there is an administrative process through the EDRC that can relieve  
32 some of that burden.  
33

34 Sorg: Yes. All right. The second question I have, I couldn't help but notice on  
35 the map this black dotted square going over Interstate 25. Does that  
36 indicate, and I might refer to the DOT on this that there is planned in the  
37 future an underpass of, of I-25 for Taylor Road?  
38

39 Murphy: I, I can answer that. Back in ...  
40

41 Sorg: Okay.  
42

43 Murphy: The 1990s the, the MPO and the, with at the time the Highway  
44 Department undertook a, the Interstate Highway Access System Study or  
45 IHAS and among many it, it, it did eventually call for an underpass at  
46 Taylor Road. So we have not developed at the, at the pace that was



1 anticipated at that, at that point in time so it doesn't need to you know we,  
2 we don't anticipate it in the up, you know in the upcoming Transportation  
3 Plan horizon but it is something that, that has been studied and  
4 recommended in the past and is you know subject, subject to be drawn in.  
5  
6 Sorg: Okay. At this moment it's still the same as it was suggested or, or planned  
7 in the, in the '90s then.  
8  
9 Murphy: It, it is. It is.  
10  
11 Sorg: Okay.  
12  
13 Murphy: It does exist in the planning document.  
14  
15 Sorg: Okay. Would that be part of your presentation on, in August then?  
16  
17 Murphy: Yes. That would ...  
18  
19 Sorg: To ...  
20  
21 Murphy: Be part of the background.  
22  
23 Sorg: To give us that. Okay. Thank you very much Madam Chair. Thank you  
24 Mr. Murphy.  
25  
26 Flores: Okay. Thank you. All right. So moving along back to the consent agenda  
27 we have motions. I don't believe we've voted on this so ...  
28  
29 Wray: Mayor Barraza.  
30  
31 Barraza: Yes. Yes.  
32  
33 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.  
34  
35 Pedroza: Yes.  
36  
37 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.  
38  
39 Doolittle: Yes.  
40  
41 Wray: Councilor Sorg.  
42  
43 Sorg: Yes.  
44  
45 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.  
46

1 Garrett: Yes.  
2  
3 Wray: Councilor Small.  
4  
5 Small: Yes.  
6  
7 Wray: Madam Chair.  
8  
9 Flores: Yes. Okay so that looks like that's passed.

10  
11 MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.  
12

13 **5. \* APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

14  
15 **5.1 \*May 13, 2015** – Minutes approved under the consent agenda vote.  
16

17 **6. ACTION ITEMS**

18  
19 **6.1 \*Resolution 15-06: A Resolution Authorizing the MPO Officer to Sign**  
20 **a Memorandum of Agreement with NMDOT Transit and Rail Division**

21  
22 Flores: And we'll move on to Action Items, 6.1, Resolution 15-06: A Resolution  
23 Authorizing the MPO Officer to Sign a Memorandum of Agreement with  
24 New Mexico Department of Transportation Transit and Rail Division.  
25

26 Barraza: Madam Chair.

27  
28 Sorg: Move to approve.  
29

30 Barraza: Oh, I think that's on the Consent Agenda.

31  
32 Flores: Oh, you're right. It's got a little star here. Sorry.  
33

34 **6.2 Resolution 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-2021**  
35 **Transportation Improvement Program**

36  
37 Flores: So we'll move to 6.2, Resolution 15-07: A Resolution Adopting the 2016-  
38 2021 Transportation Improvement Program.  
39

40 Sorg: Move to approve.

41  
42 Flores: Okay. Just now with ...  
43

44 Barraza: I second.

45  
46 Flores: Okay.

1  
2 Barraza: I will second.  
3  
4 Flores: And you have a, Mayor Barraza seconding that. The motion to approve  
5 was, what was the first one from? Who did the first motion?  
6  
7 Murphy: Councilor Sorg.  
8  
9 Flores: Councilor Sorg, okay. I will note that we have the airport, he's not here  
10 this time but at the last meeting Commissioner Hancock was saying that  
11 he would prefer not to have the airport information included. Is this the  
12 same one? Yes.  
13  
14 Wray: Madam Chair, that, that portion starts on page 60 of the packet, just if  
15 anyone wants to look at it.  
16  
17 Flores: Page 60 or page 43?  
18  
19 Wray: The airport portion starts on page 60.  
20  
21 Flores: Oh. Okay, I see what you're saying. Sixty. So ...  
22  
23 Sorg: Madam Chair.  
24  
25 Flores: Yes.  
26  
27 Sorg: I would just like to point out the roll on the actual resolution is a couple  
28 years old, has Chair Thomas and Vice-Chair Krahling. I believe that's the  
29 one we're on now, '08. Oh, that was '08.  
30  
31 Flores: Oh, this one's, this one looks updated.  
32  
33 Wray: Councilor Sorg, what page are you looking at? If, I mean if, we'll definitely  
34 get that corrected.  
35  
36 Sorg: It's 82. But I guess it's not this resolution. I thought it was this resolution, I  
37 got it, otherwise.  
38  
39 Flores: We'll just hold it for the next, okay.  
40  
41 Sorg: Yeah. Never mind.  
42  
43 Wray: Oh. So it does. We'll get that corrected when we get to that point.  
44  
45 Flores: At this point we've got, there are a few, there are quite a few little issues  
46 with the Las Cruces airport and basically Commissioner Hancock had said

1 that he would prefer to keep it out since it's not really, we don't really have  
2 control over it. My view is that I'm fine keeping it there as long as it's not  
3 overly taxing on staff and just to have it available for the public so that they  
4 can see it if they happen to, to look at our thing or to have a site referring  
5 where they can get the information. So does anybody else have any other  
6 opinions?  
7

8 Sorg: I have an opinion.

9

10 Flores: Okay. Commissioner, Councilor Sorg.

11

12 Sorg: I believe transportation includes air, airplanes and so forth so I think it has  
13 to be in here. What does our MOU with the DOT and so forth say?  
14

15 Wray: Madam Chair, Councilor Sorg. The airport, the so-called airport TIP is not  
16 required by NMDOT. It is something that was included at the behest of  
17 previous policy committees. The airport operates under the FAA which  
18 doesn't have a TIP process.  
19

20 Sorg: I see.

21

22 Wray: So it, it, it's something that, that, that this MPO has done historically for  
23 many, many years but it's not required by any other body other than, than  
24 this Committee.  
25

26 Sorg: It doesn't have to be part of the resolution, in other words.  
27

28 Wray: I think that it would be best if staff had some affirmative direction from the  
29 Committee as to whether or not to include it in the future so if you want to.  
30

31 Sorg: It's up to us then.  
32

33 Wray: Yes. It is up to you.  
34

35 Sorg: Okay.  
36

37 Doolittle: Madam Chair.  
38

39 Flores: So, so are you staying with the, you would like it there or not like it there?  
40 Why don't I, why don't I propose we just take a, a vote for people that want  
41 it in and those that don't want it in and, and I'll let Mr. Doolittle make a  
42 comment and Olga, they both want to comment. Go ahead Mr. ...  
43

44 Doolittle: I, I think I just have one question or one clarification from the last meeting.  
45 Regardless of, I guess my concern is right now it's in with the action items  
46 and regardless of whether we decide to agree or disagree with what's in

1 these tied to the, to the airport it's going, it's going to happen regardless.  
2 So I think my concern is I'd like to see the information as an informational  
3 issue but I don't know that it should be an action item because it, it doesn't  
4 really matter what we decide as a body.  
5  
6 Flores: Well the action being whether or not we put it into our documents so I'm  
7 saying we ought to just say, "We're just listing this. This isn't something  
8 we have control over. We're just listing this as a courtesy." You know.  
9  
10 Doolittle: But should it then be taken, right now it is part of our action item so should  
11 we take it, should we separate it from the things that we're voting on as an  
12 action item?  
13  
14 Wray: The, the Committee may amend the, the document; however, it sees fit so  
15 if you would like to ...  
16  
17 Flores: Do you have any suggested wording then? I mean ...  
18  
19 Doolittle: Well, well can it, can it be separated and be included in either the  
20 committee or staff comments or the discussion items for future reference  
21 and take that portion specifically out of the action item? I don't want to  
22 make it too difficult but it seems kind of odd that we're voting on an item  
23 that, that we have no authority over anyway.  
24  
25 Flores: Mr. Murphy.  
26  
27 Murphy: Madam Chair. For the, for the purposes of this action item I, I think that  
28 we would move to, to amend the attachment by deleting those pages 60  
29 on to the, on to the end of the document and then you can vote on the, on  
30 the resolution as, as amended and then you can give us, you know once  
31 we get to the staff comments you can give us direction to find another  
32 place on the website in which to publish that information.  
33  
34 Flores: Okay. Could we then have a little portion saying where it, where it is that  
35 they can find that? All right. Does that sound satisfactory and, and does  
36 Councilor Pedroza still want, want to make a comment?  
37  
38 Pedroza: I wanted to ask and I think my question has been answered whether  
39 there's any benefit to, to us to, to have it ...  
40  
41 Flores: Yes.  
42  
43 Pedroza: In here but if it's not, it's going to happen regardless of what we want and  
44 it's not our decision then I think the solution has been suggested possibly,  
45 just right.  
46

1 Flores: Actually Mr. Murphy does have a comment about that.  
2  
3 Murphy: Yes Madam Chair, Councilor Pedroza. It, it did, it did prove beneficial in,  
4 in one time in the past when the City was seeking funds to build the fire  
5 station out there and they showed that it was included on the MPO's TIP.  
6 It, it aided them in getting a grant. I'm not saying it was, was the deciding  
7 factor but they did, did cite that it was helpful that we did have that  
8 information.  
9  
10 Pedroza: Do you think that our including it as a separate section just simply saying  
11 that whatever it is that you suggest that we were going to be saying, that  
12 it's there and we're aware of it, would that be sufficient or the same kind of  
13 thing if it arises in the future?  
14  
15 Murphy: If something like that arises in the future they could say, cite that it's in the  
16 City's CIP and that's probably adequate. I think the main, you know apart  
17 from that one example, I think the main benefit of this is, is that you know  
18 just dissemination of information ...  
19  
20 Pedroza: Okay.  
21  
22 Murphy: To the public.  
23  
24 Pedroza: Okay.  
25  
26 Murphy: So from, from a staff perspective either way works.  
27  
28 Pedroza: All right. Thank you very much.  
29  
30 Flores: I just have one more clarification. We, we have rail on here but it's the  
31 same situation except that we're required to put rail, is that correct?  
32  
33 Wray: NMDOT has, has rail jurisdiction so that falls under the umbrella of  
34 NMDOT.  
35  
36 Flores: But we, but we still give the information on our TIP even though it's their ...  
37  
38 Wray: It, it's the, it, it ...  
39  
40 Flores: They make the decisions.  
41  
42 Wray: The TIP is a, is a NMDOT and FHWA required document and since rail is  
43 under that, those projects are required to go on the TIP.  
44  
45 Flores: All right. But we're not really making the decisions on rail is what, right?  
46

1 Wray: Well it, as the MPO this Committee can but the, the rail projects go on the  
2 TIP. They're, they're part of the TIP whereas the airport is not.  
3

4 Flores: Is not. Okay. All right. Okay so is that clear as mud so have we decided  
5 to basically pull it and, say, is that, I'm getting a shaking head, is anybody  
6 opposed to that? No. Okay. So that's what we'll do, okay at your  
7 direction. Anybody else have any comments on the TIP? Councilor Sorg.  
8

9 Sorg: I went through and I do have some questions. On page 46 the I-10 mill  
10 and outlay, inlay rather, sorry about that. Where, where is mile post 146  
11 to mile post six, 164?  
12

13 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg. That is from the I-10/I-25 interchange to the Texas state  
14 line.  
15

16 Sorg: Okay.  
17

18 Doolittle: So that's the six, that's the entire six-lane portion.  
19

20 Sorg: Right. Then I see a scheduled, the intersection of Spitz, Solano, Three  
21 Crosses and, and Highway 70/Main Street scheduled for this coming year,  
22 2016. Is that calendar year or fiscal year?  
23

24 Doolittle: That would be fiscal year.  
25

26 Sorg: Is that a federal fiscal year or local fiscal year?  
27

28 Doolittle: Federal fiscal year.  
29

30 Sorg: Okay. I'm just going to make a comment, is all. Being that Main Street  
31 has been tied up for so long, maybe it's a little too soon to get, start ripping  
32 up another portion of it so close to there. But you do what you have to do.  
33 The next one is on Valley Drive.  
34

35 Flores: Could you tell us the page number?  
36

37 Sorg: This is page 51.  
38

39 Flores: Okay.  
40

41 Sorg: The Highway 188 road construction. I see that's pushed off until Fiscal  
42 Year 2017. And I'm just going to make a comment that it's a shame that  
43 isn't done a little sooner but it is what it is. Next is Highway 70 on page  
44 53. The, this is a safety project I, I believe HSIP? Yeah. Where is that,  
45 162 to 170?  
46

1 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg. That's basically the safety project to allow for bicycle  
2 facilities over the pass from Organ to about to, is it going all the way to  
3 White Sands? All the way to White Sands.  
4  
5 Sorg: Wow. Okay, very good. Then I think the rest are all RoadRUNNER  
6 projects. Okay, I have one last question. We've, we've briefly mentioned  
7 this in the past but where does the interchange of Triviz and Elks and  
8 Main Street come in for the, for, for doing it over?  
9  
10 Wray: That project is on page 54.  
11  
12 Sorg: Oh, it's University.  
13  
14 Wray: Oh, sorry. Sorry. Sorry. Never mind. That ...  
15  
16 Sorg: University.  
17  
18 Wray: One's not in there. Sorry.  
19  
20 Sorg: Okay.  
21  
22 Wray: I was thinking.  
23  
24 Sorg: I know.  
25  
26 Wray: I heard Triviz and was like, "Oh, well no it's down there."  
27  
28 Sorg: Yeah. Right.  
29  
30 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg.  
31  
32 Sorg: Yes.  
33  
34 Doolittle: That project itself is currently not in our, in our STIP. We are currently, we  
35 actually had a meeting this morning. We're currently seeking funding to  
36 do a study basically from the Three Crosses interchange to the I-25  
37 interchange so that we can justify, you know does it need six lanes  
38 through there? You know how wide does the bridge need to be?  
39 What do we need to do at the Elks intersection? So ultimately right now  
40 we're in the planning, or in the study phase. Again, we're seeking that  
41 funding. Actually I think we're going to have it awarded in August,  
42 correct?  
43  
44 Sorg: Award the study ...  
45  
46 Doolittle: We're working on an RFP that will go out in August to conduct the study.



1  
2 Sorg: Okay.  
3  
4 Doolittle: Then once we have that then we'll have the ammunition to pursue some  
5 additional funding and have an idea of what it would take to, to improve  
6 that in, that last section from Three Crosses to the I-25 interchange.  
7  
8 Sorg: Okay, very good. Just one last word on that. Does the words "traffic  
9 circle" ever come up when you're doing these studies?  
10  
11 Doolittle: Yes and no.  
12  
13 Sorg: Okay.  
14  
15 Doolittle: I, I, I'm sure it will be part of the discussion but we'll just have to wait and  
16 see what the RFP comes up with and ...  
17  
18 Sorg: Okay.  
19  
20 Doolittle: Let it run through its, through its phase. Actually that's a Phase A through,  
21 A through D study. It is a complete study.  
22  
23 Sorg: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Madam Chair.  
24  
25 Flores: Okay. Anyone else? So ...  
26  
27 Small: Madam Chair.  
28  
29 Flores: Yes, Councilor Little (*Small*).  
30  
31 Small: Yes and thank you Madam Chair. Briefly, just to, the, Councilor Sorg  
32 brings up some great points. For Valley Drive and I've said it before, I  
33 want to again thank DOT, Molzen Corbin, and other partners who have  
34 produced the first of its kind public interactive website, fully interactive  
35 public meetings one of which was just last week. We've gotten a lot of  
36 great input. The public comment period ends on June 30th for, which is  
37 narrowing those initial phases so it's certainly been very educational to me  
38 to learn and to experience first-hand on such an important roadway  
39 corridor exactly how much planning and how much lead time go into  
40 these. Further I would point out that there's been a great deal of interest  
41 for Option F which folks can see if they go to valleydrive.net and that one  
42 has received a great deal of positive feedback and I think well warranted  
43 because of its promotion of reinvestment, the extra facilities for bike and  
44 pedestrian, and similarities to something on the order of Triviz which  
45 would be a, a great addition to that part of the city. So it does take a long  
46 time, it will be a very complicated project but I really do emphasize the

1 thank-yous to the folks who are involved and we have a short amount of  
2 time to make sure that we get everything right before the, goes on to the  
3 next phase.  
4  
5 Flores: When did you say the last day for public comment was?  
6  
7 Small: Thank you Madam Chair. Yes. It's June the 30th.  
8  
9 Flores: June 30th. Okay. Thank you.  
10  
11 Small: Yes. Exactly. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.  
12  
13 Flores: So is that all the comments that we had, are we ready to take a vote?  
14  
15 Pedroza: There's one more Madam Chair.  
16  
17 Flores: Okay. Sorry.  
18  
19 Pedroza: I'd like to get some reassurance and it's probably not even necessary but  
20 I've been reading in the paper that the state is, is considering calling back  
21 some funds if they have not been spent and so are we in any danger of  
22 losing any of our state funding for, for any of our road projects?  
23  
24 Wray: As far as I know no.  
25  
26 Pedroza: Okay. That's what I needed. But you will look into it.  
27  
28 Wray: We, we certainly do our best to keep on top of it.  
29  
30 Pedroza: Okay. Thank you.  
31  
32 Flores: All right.  
33  
34 Wray: We need to amend the existing motion to delete pages.  
35  
36 Flores: Oh that's right. Okay.  
37  
38 Wray: 60 through 76.  
39  
40 Flores: So, so do I have a motion to amend, to delete the pages having to do with  
41 the airport?  
42  
43 Pedroza: So moved.  
44  
45 Flores: Okay. And do I hear ...  
46

1 Garrett: Second.  
2  
3 Flores: Second by Commissioner Garrett. First motion by Councilor Pedroza.  
4 Okay. All in favor?  
5  
6 Wray: Should we do a roll call for that?  
7  
8 Flores: Okay.  
9  
10 Wray: Mayor Barraza.  
11  
12 Barraza: Yes.  
13  
14 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.  
15  
16 Pedroza: Yes.  
17  
18 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.  
19  
20 Doolittle: Yes.  
21  
22 Wray: Councilor Sorg.  
23  
24 Sorg: Yes.  
25  
26 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.  
27  
28 Garrett: Yes.  
29  
30 Wray: Councilor Small.  
31  
32 Small: Yes.  
33  
34 Wray: Madam Chair.  
35  
36 Flores: Yes. Okay.  
37  
38 Wray: And now for the main ...  
39  
40 Flores: Okay, and so going back to the motion.  
41  
42 Wray: Mayor Barraza.  
43  
44 Barraza: Yes.  
45  
46 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.

1  
2 Pedroza: Yes.  
3  
4 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.  
5  
6 Doolittle: Yes.  
7  
8 Wray: Councilor Sorg.  
9  
10 Sorg: Yes.  
11  
12 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.  
13  
14 Garrett: Yes.  
15  
16 Wray: Councilor Small.  
17  
18 Small: Yes.  
19  
20 Wray: Madam Chair.  
21  
22 Flores: Yes. Okay. So that's passed.

23  
24 **6.3 Resolution 15-08: A resolution Adopting the 2015-2040 Metropolitan**  
25 **Transportation Plan (Transport 2040)**  
26

27 Flores: Let's go to 6.3, Resolution 15-08: A Resolution Adopting the 2015-2040  
28 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.  
29  
30 Wray: Thank you Madam Chair. MPO staff is pleased to bring this before you  
31 today. This is the culmination of over two years' worth of work. This is the  
32 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This will be kind of the flagship  
33 document of the MPO that you're adopt, that you're, is before you today.  
34 Just to give a brief background of the current Transport 2040 that was  
35 adopted in July of 2010, we do want to highlight a couple of the  
36 accomplishments: The adoption of the MPO Access Management  
37 Guidelines, the adoption last year of the Transportation Asset and Safety  
38 Management Plan, and also want to highlight the completion of the Mesilla  
39 Valley Intermodal Transit Terminal during that, during that time frame.  
40 As I said this has been a, a two-plus year process. In addition to  
41 the public involvement dates that you see listed on the screen before you,  
42 MPO staff has also reached out to such organizations as the Ocotillo  
43 Institute, the American Civil Engineering Companies, we've had multiple  
44 meetings with the Chambers of Commerce and we've also had multiple  
45 work sessions with both of the Advisory Committees as well as having

1 offered this Committee multiple opportunities to comment on the  
2 document.

3 I'm not going to go into detail on the content of the chapters today  
4 as everyone has, as we've already done that multiple times in the past but  
5 I do want to highlight that in Chapter 4, that's where we have included the  
6 performance measures that are required by Map 21. They are at this time  
7 kind of a, a skeletal base to build from but we have included safety, safety  
8 measures that are one of the things that we know that FHWA is going to  
9 be looking for going forward. We also, and there will be a presentation  
10 about the Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan as well but we've  
11 also been working with DOT to make sure that performance measures are  
12 going to be lining up across the board on, on all levels.

13 Additionally, Chapter 6, the financial section of the document was  
14 also one of the ones that received extensive revision during the writing  
15 process. Now while we were doing the research and, and gathering the  
16 public input for this document there were a couple of key factors that  
17 presented themselves to us. One is that population growth rate in Dona  
18 Ana County and in New Mexico at large is slowing down. I can see this  
19 myself in the work that I do for the MPO on the development review side.  
20 There are fewer cases now, distinctly fewer cases now than there were in  
21 the past when I started with the MPO. Additionally VMT has peaked and  
22 is in a process of going through a slight decline as you can see on the  
23 graph in the lower left. The MPO staff, in all of our research we have seen  
24 nothing to indicate that that trend is going to reverse any time soon so that  
25 is a factor that we have incorporated into the recommendations that we've  
26 made in the document. On a, a sort of national scale obviously you all are  
27 aware that the, one of the major impacts of this is the gas tax is both going  
28 down and not able to pay for as much.

29 During our public input process as well as the writing process MPO  
30 staff sort of coalesced the principles that you see there on the screen.  
31 Again we worked closely with NMDOT, with the City of Las Cruces and  
32 their Sustainability Program, with Viva Dona Ana, with a number of  
33 different stakeholders and groups to make sure that our goals were going  
34 to be in alignment with the goals of the other organizations both regionally  
35 and across the state. I do want to point out and highlight that the most  
36 fundamental aspect of the plan is that it calls for the maintenance and, and  
37 improving of the existing transportation system first before any expansion  
38 is considered. We also want to make sure that the transportation network  
39 is connecting people with jobs and goods and services that they need and  
40 is also preserving the natural, cultural, historical, and agricultural  
41 resources and is also following good healthy and livability practices. Also  
42 again, the last principle there is one of the performance measures  
43 specifically called for by FHWA is that we increase safety and that safety,  
44 safety be one of our key priorities.

45 Again this is the list of the specific recommendations that are in the  
46 document. Again the fix, it first prioritized maintenance above highway

1 expansion, support ITS, and invest in public transit. Those are ways of  
2 increasing the capacity of the existing network without expansion. We  
3 also wish to, on an MPO level we wish to continue to develop the  
4 Transportation Asset and Safety Management Plan to better target public  
5 funding and also to improve our knowledge base of the infrastructure that  
6 is within the MPO area and also hopefully utilize that to target  
7 maintenance and better plan for, for those purposes. We also wish to  
8 invest more in relatively inexpensive projects such as bicycle, pedestrian,  
9 and public transit improvements and we also would like, the plan calls for  
10 consideration of reducing roadway widths so that the transportation  
11 system is less expensive to maintain going forward.

12 Now the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed this document  
13 last Thursday at their June 4th meeting and recommended approval. The  
14 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed the  
15 document and recommended approval at their May 9th meeting, or May  
16 19th meeting, excuse me. These are the actions that the Policy  
17 Committee may take of the document today. You may adopt it as is.  
18 There also may be some changes that you would like for, to see  
19 incorporated that can be done fairly quickly or you may send us back with  
20 some revisions that you would like us to do before we bring it back to you.  
21 And that concludes my presentation. I will stand now for any questions.

22  
23 Flores: Anyone have any questions or comments? Councilor Pedroza.

24  
25 Pedroza: I have a comment. I read in the paper today that Las Cruces was  
26 recognized as a bronze level city in terms of bicycles usage or bicycle  
27 safety so congratulations.

28  
29 Flores: Okay. All right. Anyone else? Councilor Small.

30  
31 Small: Thank you Madam Chair. Thank you and it, it's, really falls in line with,  
32 with much great policy and, and again kudos to the staff developing it.  
33 One of the items and this was mentioned at a previous meeting, as far as  
34 not only in-roadway bicycle facilities but also PAS developed especially  
35 now that the state legislation was passed earlier this decade allowing for  
36 pedestrian and, and bicycle paths along the ditches, acequias, whatever  
37 we want to call them, does that, how does that figure in directly to this  
38 policy document? Is it too, too into the weeds or the dirt as it may be or is  
39 it in line and in there?

40  
41 Wray: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. We didn't bring the maps today because  
42 we felt that everyone had seen them a number of times already but trails  
43 would certainly be, we, in fact we do have trails on the Trail Plan. There is  
44 a Trail Plan map so anything like that would be included on our, on our  
45 documents.

1 Small: Understood. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Chair.  
2  
3 Flores: Okay. Actually Councilor Sorg and then we'll go with Commissioner  
4 Garrett so go ahead. Didn't you say you wanted to make a comment?  
5  
6 Sorg: Yes. I'm having a hard time hearing. You're so close.  
7  
8 Flores: Okay.  
9  
10 Sorg: Yeah. Thank you staff for all this hard work that you did, all these public  
11 meetings and all, put, putting together with this plan. I, I just have to  
12 comment the fact that according to our recent citizen surveys the City has  
13 done, this plan looks to me like it's right in line with the vast majority of the  
14 people here in, in, least in Las Cruces if not in the County. So  
15 congratulations.  
16  
17 Flores: Okay. Commissioner Garrett.  
18  
19 Garrett: Thank you and, and actually I would say that based on the Viva Dona Ana  
20 effort that the, the plan is also fairly consistent with the, the values and,  
21 and interests that we've heard from the larger population throughout the  
22 County. You know I'm wanting to ask, probably Mr. Murphy. You've been  
23 working with the old plan, you've been looking at the new plan. This could  
24 actually come from any of the staff but I'd be interested in what you see as  
25 the most significant changes between the old plan and this update. You  
26 know if you were to highlight what things have, have emerged, and just an  
27 example I think has to do with the idea that we're, we're not, we're not as  
28 committed to ring roads just as an example that we're, we're looking at  
29 filling in and fixing things and I mean there seem to be a number of  
30 important messages to the public and I'm just curious about whether you  
31 could summarize. I'm talking to give you a chance to collect your  
32 thoughts. But I think it's important when we do these kinds of plans to be  
33 able to highlight what the changes are, not just what it is but how it's  
34 different than what, what we've had in the past.  
35  
36 Murphy: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett. Thank you. I, I think the best way  
37 would be kind of, kind of contrast back you know looking back to the, the  
38 public comment we had here at the beginning of the meeting and the map  
39 that we brought up to look at that. Prior, I think prior to development of  
40 this plan people looked at the MPO products and they said, "Okay where,  
41 where's the region going to grow, what direction, what are going to be the  
42 new roadways, what are we going to build?" I think that was, that was  
43 what everyone thought when they thought MPO and as Mr. Wray outlined  
44 in the, in the presentation I, we're changing this document to more of a  
45 philosophy of fix it first and I think you know, and you know, if I you know  
46 may speak for Mr. Doolittle's staff there I think for years they have been,

1 they have been focusing on the maintenance activities within the district  
2 and it's been a philosophy that the DOT has taken up. I know that you  
3 know speaking with the, the County Engineering staff, they're very  
4 concerned with the condition, the City Public Works staff and  
5 Transportation staff are very, very much concerned with it so I think finally  
6 we're getting a document that's in line with what staff has experienced day  
7 to day and so from a policy standpoint we're saying that that's our, our  
8 number one priority at this point and I think that's, that's the real change  
9 with this document over the previous document.

10  
11 **Garrett:** Thank you. I, I would also say that, that I'm, I'm really struck by the, the  
12 kind of grounding in multimodal so, bicycles just as an example. This isn't  
13 just about the, about cars and trucks. It's, it's much broader than that and  
14 I think that that's, that's an important part of this, plus probably the  
15 recognition of sort of the broader impact of working on our transportation  
16 systems in terms of health and, and community development and  
17 economic development. I mean there's a lot more I think strength in terms  
18 of understanding that and, and supporting that. So I think it's a good  
19 document, good step forward.

20  
21 **Flores:** Mr. Doolittle.

22  
23 **Doolittle:** Thank you Madam Chair and, and Tom and, and Commissioner Garrett. I  
24 think I'd like to expand just a little bit on the maintenance portion. You  
25 know I, I, I think that's something we focused on for a long time but really  
26 what we've been doing is we've been doing a lot of Band-Aids. So our,  
27 our facilities are 50 years old, we come in, we take two inches off and we  
28 put two inches back, and then in five to seven years we're doing the exact  
29 same thing again. And so I think this concept of maintaining what we  
30 already have is going to take, is going to go a step further through our  
31 Asset Management Program where you're going to start seeing us doing  
32 full reconstruction on some of our facilities, and that's not really  
33 maintenance but that truly is taking care of the facilities that we already  
34 have. So I think you're going to start seeing some, some more costly  
35 projects, you're going to see some shortened projects because of those  
36 costs but that's in an effort to truly try to fix and, and build the roadways  
37 that are there rather than keep putting on these short-term Band-Aids, and  
38 that'll incorporate this, you know the statewide program, you know there's  
39 no way that our district can rebuild I-10 and I-25. It's just not going to  
40 happen. So I think this idea of a, of a statewide program where they really  
41 focus on where the needs need to go, so I, I think this, this term of  
42 "maintain" could be misconstrued a little bit because reconstruction is not  
43 really maintenance but it is taking care of the facilities so I think you're  
44 going to see it go a step further than we've really, than we've really seen  
45 in the past and that's to the asset management and the performance  
46 measures tied to, to Map 21 but Tom's exactly right. I think you, you're



1 going to see us spend a lot more money on our existing facilities to try to  
2 perform the, the, the tasks or the, the processes that should've been  
3 performed through the life of that project in order to get back on track.  
4  
5 Flores: Okay. Mayor Barraza.  
6  
7 Barraza: Okay. Thank you Madam Chair. I just also reiterate what the others that  
8 have spoken prior to myself have said and the staff, just the outreach that  
9 you all have done in terms of the public, having your meetings with the  
10 public, listening, collaborating with different agencies and also with the  
11 different advisory committees that we have with the MPO. I think the staff  
12 has done an excellent job of outreaching to the public and all the  
13 stakeholders and they've had an opportunity to comment and I think  
14 you've been able to take those comments, incorporate them into this  
15 document what is best for this whole community so I, I, I'm very pleased  
16 with the document we have before us. Thank you.  
17  
18 Flores: Okay. Thank you. Councilor Sorg did you want to bring up the  
19 maintenance now on the signatures?  
20  
21 Sorg: Do we need an amendment for that?  
22  
23 Wray: I don't know that we need an amendment. We'll certainly get that  
24 corrected. That was just a ...  
25  
26 Sorg: Okay.  
27  
28 Flores: That seems to me like, as a ...  
29  
30 Wray: Complete oversight.  
31  
32 Sorg: From old documents some place.  
33  
34 Wray: Yeah.  
35  
36 Flores: Was part of what, four ...  
37  
38 Wray: Yeah, the, that was ...  
39  
40 Flores: That the MPO staff was hereby authorized to administratively update the  
41 transportation plan for spelling. I guess that's not necessarily this  
42 resolution. Okay.  
43  
44 Pedroza: Madam Chair.  
45  
46 Flores: Yes, Commissioner, or Councilor Pedroza.

1  
2 Pedroza: Thank you Madam Chair. I wanted to, I, I may have at some point already  
3 in another one of our previous meetings mentioned but I, I read a book  
4 that was excellent and it touched on this and seems to be very, very  
5 important and I was very glad to read in the plan itself that you, that you  
6 talk about a very difficult process that we're going to be having to address  
7 and by we I mean all of the elected officials of public bodies which is  
8 funding. The book that I read was Losing Our Way and I can't tell you  
9 who the author is cause I can't remember but he, well starts his book and  
10 it is not fiction, it's a fact, with the collapse of a bridge in I believe it was  
11 Montana?  
12  
13 Sorg: Minneapolis.  
14  
15 Pedroza: Minneapolis, Minnesota. And he does it in such a way that you're horrified  
16 because he, he, he focuses on one particular woman who as a result of  
17 the collapse of the bridge is left paralyzed and the, the bridge collapsed on  
18 the day that she was going home to plan her wedding. So it is extremely  
19 moving. And then he says that you know everybody knew this bridge was  
20 needed, needed major repairs. So what I think we're dealing with is that  
21 as, as Commissioner Doolittle says we have neglected and we're going to  
22 have to find ways to, to catch up with all the things that we have left and  
23 so if it's call, if we need to say it's not just repair it's reconstruction and we  
24 know that it has to be funded, then we're going to have to address those  
25 really hard decisions of how do we fund it. So thank you for including  
26 those things and I think it's a very good document. Thank you.  
27  
28 Flores: Anyone else? Okay so we decided we didn't need an amendment just to  
29 change the names ...  
30  
31 Wray: I ...  
32  
33 Flores: To the correct names and ...  
34  
35 Wray: I don't think so.  
36  
37 Flores: Okay so then should we take a vote?  
38  
39 Barraza: Madam Chair I think we need a motion on the floor and I ...  
40  
41 Flores: Oh, I thought we'd already done ...  
42  
43 Barraza: And I so ...  
44  
45 Flores: The motion. Sorry.  
46

1 Barraza: I will make that motion.  
2  
3 Flores: Okay.  
4  
5 Barraza: That we approve Resolution 15-08.  
6  
7 Flores: All right.  
8  
9 Sorg: I'll second it.  
10  
11 Flores: Seconded by Councilor Sorg.  
12  
13 Wray: Mayor Barraza.  
14  
15 Barraza: Yes.  
16  
17 Wray: Councilor Pedroza.  
18  
19 Pedroza: Yes.  
20  
21 Wray: Mr. Doolittle.  
22  
23 Doolittle: Yes.  
24  
25 Wray: Councilor Sorg.  
26  
27 Sorg: Yes.  
28  
29 Wray: Commissioner Garrett.  
30  
31 Garrett: Yes.  
32  
33 Wray: Councilor Small.  
34  
35 Small: Yes.  
36  
37 Wray: Madam Chair.  
38  
39 Flores: Yes. Okay. So it's passed.  
40  
41 MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1 **7. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

2  
3 **7.1 NMDOT Long Range Transportation Plan**

4  
5 Flores: So we're on to Discussion Item 7.1: New Mexico Department of  
6 Transportation Long Range Transportation Plan. Is that going to be a  
7 presentation?  
8

9 Wray: Yes Madam Chair. At this time Jolene Herrera from NMDOT will present.

10  
11 Herrera: Good afternoon. I'm Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Asset Management and  
12 Planning Division. I have to just warn you all up front that I did not create  
13 this presentation. There's a lot of animations in it so I might be kind of  
14 flipping through and if you have any questions at any time please feel free  
15 to stop me and ask as we go through.  
16

17 Flores: Okay.

18  
19 Herrera: Okay. So this is what we're going to go over today in this presentation:  
20 An overview of the plan development process, the why, the how, how did  
21 we engage people, what did they tell us when we did talk to them, and  
22 then we'll go over a little bit of how the plan is organized. We'll go into a  
23 little bit more detail about some of the, the visions, goals, and strategies  
24 and then we'll talk just briefly about how we plan to implement this long-  
25 range plan.

26 So first of all let's talk about the plan development process. Why  
27 did we develop the plan: To provide a visionary, transparent, predictable,  
28 performance-based, and strategic framework to guide decision-making at  
29 all levels within the DOT and by New Mexico's MPOs and RTPOs. That  
30 part is important because it means that we all work together at the same  
31 time to make sure that all of our plans are in line with each other, we don't  
32 have any contradicting information in our plans; in fact the RTPO plans  
33 are chapters in our plan and then you know the, the MPO has their own  
34 plan but like I said we did work closely with them to make sure that  
35 everything was in line. Also we're required to do long-range plans. It's a  
36 requirement of Map 21, the Federal Transportation Legislation but it's also  
37 a really good idea. How do you know where you're going and how you're  
38 going to get there if you don't have a plan?

39 So how did we develop the plan: There were four different phases.  
40 The first phase was to look at the existing conditions and really ask,  
41 "Where are we right now?" That was a lot of data collection and  
42 assessment. We completed that phase summer of 2014. Phase Two was  
43 completed fall of 2014 and that was really to give us our strategic  
44 direction. So we know where we are now. Where do we want to go in the  
45 future? We came up with visions, goals and objectives. We talked a little  
46 bit about performance measures and the caveat on that is that we don't

1 have the final rules on all our performance measures from the feds yet but  
2 we decided along with the MPOs that we're not going to wait. We're just  
3 going to go ahead and move forward with our planning efforts and  
4 whenever they make their performance measure rules then we'll just have  
5 to adjust accordingly. We also looked at some different scenarios which is  
6 something new for us. We've never done that before so it was really  
7 interesting to, to kind of see that and incorporate it into the plan. Phase  
8 Three we, we completed winter of 2014 and that was really talking about  
9 resource allocation and got more into the alternatives analysis. And then  
10 Phase Four which is implementation, we're in the public review/comment  
11 period right now. It ends June 26th. There's a slide on that a little bit later  
12 but it's really trying to get us to knowing what it's going to take to  
13 implement all of the other things that are laid out in the plan.

14 We considered three planning scenarios, funding scenarios in our  
15 planning process and sort of a fourth one. I'll talk a little bit about that. So  
16 first of all we looked at just baseline revenue. If everything stays flat for  
17 the next 40 years and we don't have any increases or decreases how can  
18 we, how do we want to plan for that? So first of all we said, "Do we want  
19 to continue existing commitments to the extent possible?" meaning  
20 business as usual. Do we want to just keep doing what we're doing  
21 without changing anything if revenue stays the same or do we want to  
22 focus commitments on some different types of tiers? And the tiers are  
23 basically, it's not one tier for all modes. Each mode might have its own  
24 tier so for example Interstate 10 might be a top tier for vehicles but it's  
25 probably not going to be a top tier for bicycles. So we did look at, at some  
26 of those different things and tried to decide where to put our money in  
27 different tiers for different modes. And then of course we looked at high  
28 revenue. Well let's say we allow toll roads. Let's say the gas tax  
29 increases, let's say something happens where we get more revenue for  
30 transportation. What would we like to see happen if that were to become  
31 a reality? We would be able to meet all of our commitments existing and  
32 then achieve some goals. What are the goals that we'd want to achieve?  
33 And then we internally looked at the low revenue scenario. We didn't vet  
34 that out through the public just because we didn't, you know we didn't  
35 want to scare everyone away but it is something that we looked at  
36 internally and it's basically just, "What would we be able to achieve if the  
37 bottom fell out, if we lost a major employer, if the gas tax went down,  
38 something like that?" So we did look at that, we just didn't want to scare  
39 anybody. And you're not meant to be able to read these at all. We just  
40 wanted to show you that these were actually the three alternative sheets  
41 that we came up with and we handed these out at our working groups and  
42 had everybody look through them and basically it just gives you a really  
43 quick side-by-side view of what's different between each of the different  
44 alternatives so it, the one in the middle, Alternative B that was where we  
45 looked at the tiers. The first one over, Alternative A is where we just kept  
46 everything the same, and then Alternative C was really if we got more

1 revenue that these are the things that we wanted to do so you could go  
2 through and look and pick which things you liked and it was just really  
3 easy for comparison's sake.

4 How did we engage stakeholders? Well I can tell you we talked to  
5 everybody, literally everybody. We took a top down approach meaning  
6 that internally we had upper management on board with this process from  
7 the very beginning. We also talked to the public. We talked to  
8 stakeholders. We talked to all sorts of working groups. We had nine  
9 statewide working groups that are all listed there. They were based on  
10 various things, most of them fit around the seven national goals for  
11 transportation and then we added a, a couple of other ones. We also had  
12 seven regional working groups and those are in line with our RTP  
13 boundaries. We talked to citizens, visitors, other groups. We had an  
14 NMDOT Coordinating Committee, Trent was on that Committee. It was  
15 our, our DEs and above, our upper management. We had an MPO and  
16 RTP Coordinating Committee so all of the ideas that were coming in  
17 from the public or any comments that, that we received from working  
18 groups were vetted through the MPOs and RTPs first. We also had an  
19 interagency coordinating committee. That means that we talked to other  
20 state agencies, we talked to BLM, we talked to everybody. That's all I can  
21 say. We literally talked to thousands of people during this process. We  
22 also had a tribal coordinating committee. We had participation from all 22  
23 tribes in the state and so that was something that is also new in this plan  
24 versus the old plan. We didn't have as much input from the tribes as we  
25 needed to and so this plan we did a really good job at incorporating the  
26 tribes into it as well.

27 So what did the stakeholders tell us after talking to all these  
28 people? These are the things that they told us that were important to  
29 them: First of all identify sustainable revenue sources and use resources  
30 efficiently. Preserve and maintain what we already have, number two. I  
31 think that's been made clear that it's the MPO's top priority as well so  
32 again that falls in line with our state plan. You can see a lot of the, the  
33 things in there: Address public health and safety needs. Public health  
34 and transportation have really kind of been kept separate and I think this  
35 plan is the first time where we've started putting them together, which they  
36 should be. There's a lot of studies and things out there that show that  
37 there's a link between them so instead of ignoring it we said, "You know  
38 what? Let's go ahead and take a look at this and incorporate it into our  
39 plan." And so we did. We also heard that we need to protect and  
40 preserve what makes New, New Mexico special. Tourism is a big part of  
41 our economy in this state and so we had to listen to what visitors to our  
42 state had to say as well and try to incorporate their needs into our plan as  
43 well. There's one more, improved data collection. That's something that,  
44 we always all need more data and so our plan focuses a lot on how we  
45 can get the data that we don't have and how we can use the data that we  
46 do have now more efficiently.

1           Okay let's talk about the transportation plan. How is it organized?  
2 There's chapters. Let me get through all these. Okay. So first of all we  
3 have just a basic introduction: What is the plan meant to do, what does it  
4 tell you? We go into the challenges and opportunities which was the  
5 "where are we now?" phase that I told you about. The goals and  
6 strategies are really the meat of the plan. We have five goals in our plan  
7 and each one of them has its own strategies and actions to meet those  
8 goals and then we have a chapter on performance measures. Like I said  
9 that will probably be changing based on what Federal Highways gets to us  
10 eventually and then we have an implementation plan as sort of the very  
11 last chapter, oh and then we have appendices. This visual took a lot of  
12 people a lot of time to make and it was made this way deliberately. You  
13 can see our vision over there. That also took a lot of people a lot of time  
14 to come up with. We listened to input from our regional working groups  
15 and all of those words were chosen strategically so take a minute to read  
16 it, make sure you all agree with it. While you're doing that if you notice  
17 how the goals are set out, we have five but Goal Number One: Operate  
18 with transparency and accountability really encompasses all of the other  
19 goals as well which is why it sort of goes around because we need to do  
20 that anyway and we need to do that with each one of our goals.

21           Goal Number Two is to improve safety for all system users. There  
22 is the multimodal aspect of the plan. We're not just talking about cars,  
23 we're talking about bikes, people walking, people on horses, motorcycles,  
24 people traveling by rail, every kind of system user you can think of.

25           Goal Number Three: Preserve and maintain our transportation  
26 assets for the long term. So this is something also in line with what the  
27 MPO was talking about, asset management plans. The state is working  
28 on ours. It will be part of this plan, part of the implementation I guess, part  
29 of the plan.

30           Goal Number Four: Provide multimodal access and connectivity for  
31 community prosperity. That one's really important for local communities  
32 because it's about connecting them, it really is. It's about connecting  
33 people to where they need to go. So how do we get someone from T or C  
34 to Las Cruces to go to the hospital? Those are the kinds of questions that  
35 we tried to get to with that goal.

36           And then Goal Number Five: Respect New Mexico's cultures,  
37 environment, history, and quality of life. And like I said we've never really  
38 had health in our transportation plans before. Goal Number Five with the  
39 quality of life statement really starts to get to creating healthier  
40 communities through the transportation system so it's really interesting to  
41 see that.

42           Let's go a little bit more into the goals and the strategies now.  
43 Okay, oops, so the first goal, transparency and accountability, these are  
44 the things that we want to work on. A lot of this is more internal. For  
45 instance the first strategy outstanding customer-focused employees, so  
46 we're internally looking at how we can create a better workforce to serve

1 our, the public better and we're also looking at how we can gain more trust  
2 from the public and support local governments where we need to. We're  
3 looking to retain partnerships that have been created through this planning  
4 process. We've talked to a lot of different people. We've created a lot of  
5 working groups and some of them we're looking to maintain throughout  
6 the life of this plan and then when we go on to future plans to keep those,  
7 those groups intact. And then data and information, that's a really big  
8 emphasis area for us. I said earlier we're looking to improve the quality of  
9 our data and we're looking at how we can better provide that to local  
10 governments, to the public, just being better at data collection in general.

11 Goal Number Two: Safety for all system users. We want to have a  
12 data-driven proactive process and part of the, what we heard out of the  
13 regional working groups is people want us to be more proactive. So right,  
14 how it used to be in the past is if you wanted to spend safety money you  
15 had to have a crash and unfortunately a lot of times it had to be a fatal  
16 crash. We don't want to do that anymore. We want to know what the  
17 issues are, where the problem places are so we can hopefully prevent that  
18 crash from happening and so part of that is going to be implementation of,  
19 of our strategic highway safety plan. It also will be in line with this plan  
20 though as well so. And then again partnership with other agencies so we  
21 want to keep and just maintain all of those partnerships that we've already  
22 created. Sorry for all the visualizations here.

23 Preservation and maintenance: This one I think you know we've,  
24 we've talked about it a lot. Trent had some really good points about what  
25 preservation and maintenance really mean but I think we're looking at it  
26 more from implementing our transportation asset management plan so  
27 once we implement that we'll have a very clear picture of what needs to be  
28 done on each one of our roadways. We'll be implementing that program  
29 and so we will be looking at life cycle cost analysis our roads, probably we  
30 will be spending a lot more money on certain sections of roads but it's just  
31 what we need to do. You'll also probably be seeing a lot more  
32 maintenance projects like chip seals and fog seals and things, things that  
33 we haven't done in the past to maintain our pavement over a longer  
34 lifespan.

35 Prioritization by tier, we talked a little bit about that just you know  
36 that different modes have different tiers so keep that in mind. Let's see.  
37 Legacy challenges: Ensure that NMDOT can affordably meet minimum  
38 condition standards for each roadway tier. This is one that the tiers and  
39 the legacy challenges, it's one that we've struggled with just because a lot  
40 of our state is rural and so we're trying to balance I guess maintaining  
41 tiers. So just keep in mind that it's not all about the interstates. It's also  
42 about connecting communities as well and so that's something that we  
43 look at really in, in these two bullets here. And then training and capacity  
44 building, that's again more internal. We want to give our people the tools  
45 that they need to do their jobs well.



1 Access and connectivity, I really want to point the, to the second  
2 bullet there: Strategic investment in key corridors. This sort of goes back  
3 to the tiers but again a key corridor doesn't always mean what has the  
4 most traffic on it. It's really about connecting places so you know the road  
5 between Silver City and Lordsburg maybe doesn't see a whole lot of traffic  
6 but it's, it's needed to get those people back and forth. So that could be a,  
7 a key corridor that we invest in. It's really just not about cars I guess is the  
8 point.

9 And then the last bullet there: Land use and transportation  
10 coordination. This is something that's also been sort of talked about  
11 internally and externally but it's never been memorialized in one of our  
12 plans so we're doing that. We're starting to really look at what land uses  
13 are and how we can build a better transportation system for those land  
14 uses and make sure that we're using taxpayer money efficiently. Oh, and  
15 then changing demographics. We can't forget that we are an aging  
16 population. We will have an older population by the time this plan runs  
17 out, 2040 and so we need to really start planning for that and how are we  
18 going to move people around, people that choose not to drive or that can't  
19 drive that need to get to medical appointments or shopping, so that's a, we  
20 looked at that a lot in this plan too.

21 And then last but not least: Respect cultures, environment, history,  
22 and quality of life. New Mexico's a different kind of state. We don't want  
23 to make it like every other state. We have to realize that we do have  
24 special things here that people want to come and see and so like I said we  
25 did talk to a lot of the tourist industries to ask them what we could do to  
26 better our transportation system for them but then still keep in mind the  
27 local residents. Something that I want to point to is the second bullet  
28 there. We're not sure exactly how we're going to implement this but it's a  
29 very interesting concept: Require and respect local plans. So something  
30 that we heard at our regional working groups is that if a local government  
31 puts money into doing plans and has a really good idea of what they want  
32 to look like in the future, why shouldn't we reward them for doing that?  
33 And so we're talking about possibly trying to set aside funds to help them  
34 implement some of the projects that come out of those plans. So like I  
35 said we haven't figured out exactly how to do that yet but it's definitely  
36 something that we have support from upper management on. With all of  
37 the, the Viva Dona Ana efforts that have gone on it could be really  
38 beneficial for the area.

39 So now implementing the plan, there's four parts to it. I'm not  
40 exactly sure what this visual is supposed to say, just that it's a cyclical  
41 process I guess. Something that, that really is new for us is the assess  
42 thing so we've made these plans, we've put them on the shelf, some  
43 people look at them sometimes but we've never really looked at, "Are we  
44 meeting our goals? Are we actually able to use the strategies that we laid  
45 out?" And so we're working on coming up with an either yearly or every  
46 other year report that says how we're meeting the goals in our plan. So

1 it's really something new for us. We're all kind of worried and excited  
2 about it but it's good because it's always good to look at, "How, how do we  
3 need to change things? Maybe this strategy isn't working for us but  
4 maybe we can tweak it a little bit." It's just something we've never looked  
5 at but we should've been. So that's really different for us in this plan.

6 Our next steps: Right now we are in the public comment period.  
7 Here's some dates, some of them have already passed. I just wanted to  
8 show you that we've been doing presentations to every single MPO and  
9 RTPO, technical committee, and board all throughout the state. We had a  
10 public meeting in Las Cruces on the third, public meeting in Albuquerque  
11 on the fourth, and in Santa Fe on the eighth. June 26th is the end of our  
12 public comment period. We hope to send the plan to our state  
13 transportation commission on July 16th to approve at least the goals and  
14 strategies and then we hope to have final approval in August for  
15 implementation of the plan October 1st with the start of Fiscal Year 2016.

16 Here is the website for the plan. You can read through everything.  
17 There's also comment forms available on that same website so if you  
18 have any comments that you'd like to make please you can e-mail them  
19 in. There's an e-mail address there. You can fill out a comment form.  
20 You can send them to me however you feel most comfortable but please  
21 get us your comments back by, by the 26th. And that's all. I'll go back to  
22 that so you guys can see the website there. Are there any questions?

23  
24 Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

25  
26 Garrett: Thank you. This looks really good. I, I've taken a quick look at it but I, I'm  
27 going to go back in there, there are, are two things that I wanted to just  
28 comment on. One is I think the idea of supporting local planning is really  
29 good. One way to help deal with the potential conflict between state plans  
30 and local plans which I think you are recognizing in, in your comments is  
31 to make sure that there's authority and support for NMDOT to participate  
32 in local planning efforts because if you can be part of those processes by  
33 sharing information, by helping people understand how their community or  
34 their planning area fits into the larger regional and statewide system, that  
35 might avoid some of the potential conflicts. Then you got to deal with the  
36 values that, that come into play but at least everybody's working from the  
37 same sort of ground information and I think that that might help avoid  
38 some of the awkwardness of, "Well that's, that's something you came up  
39 with but that's not a great idea from the state perspective." And I think that  
40 that also then leads into my, my second concern. I, I still am interested in  
41 how the state plan will adjust to changes in economic conditions and part  
42 of that I think, it, it's one thing if you got a road that's going to a, a, a  
43 community that had a small coal mine and, or, or, or some other kind of  
44 let's say natural gas area but all of a sudden that, that is an area that, that  
45 booms in terms of economic activity. You've got a lot more traffic on that  
46 road so you build that road to accommodate the new traffic. You could

1 say, "Well we already had a, a, a place, a, a, a route in, in, in place before  
2 we made the changes to that road." It's not quite the same as the two  
3 conditions that I've been concerned with for Dona Ana County which have  
4 to do with the southern road and its access to the spaceport which is a  
5 state project and I still contend that, that the roadways from the north and  
6 the south to the spaceport should be part of the state system. I think  
7 leaving that up to counties to do all the maintenance when it's potentially a  
8 major economic issue for the region is, is really, it's inconsistent with the  
9 plan is I guess what I would say. And I think the, the same kind of thought  
10 applies to my concern with a, some kind of a bypass from Santa Teresa  
11 hooking into I-10 above Anthony because if we continue to run trucks and  
12 heavy traffic and all of the other traffic that needs to get to Santa Teresa  
13 and the border through existing communities, that's not good for land use.  
14 That's, there's a lot of, lot of problems. I realize that means creating at  
15 least in part a new road. And so that, we didn't anticipate this system that  
16 would demand, or the changes that would demand that kind of adjustment  
17 in, in our transportation system. I've got to think that there are other  
18 places in the state where this kind of thing comes up as well. I understand  
19 and I support the idea of eliminating the amount of state roads in your  
20 system but I don't think that that should mean we are frozen in time  
21 forever in terms of putting in new roadways where it's really appropriate  
22 and where there's no other really good way to do what needs to be done  
23 in terms of protecting communities, enhancing land use, you know moving  
24 traffic and that sort of thing. So I just would, I, I'm going to look to make  
25 sure how that's addressed. I think that the, the goals and, and the overall  
26 structure is very good and I support that. But I think these were two things  
27 that sort of jumped out at me in terms of stuff that we're dealing with here.  
28 Thank you.

29  
30 Herrera: Madam Chair. If I can just, so you bring up a really good point. I guess  
31 just to, to clarify, this plan will not have a project list in it so we're not  
32 looking at anything like that. I guess the point I'm trying to make is we're  
33 not excluding the possibility of new roadways being needed. We're just  
34 trying to create a framework that says we need to look at life cycle costs  
35 and those types of things when we're making those decisions so I think  
36 we're sort of on the, on the same page but please feel free to, to send any  
37 comments in.

38  
39 Flores: Commissioner Garrett.

40  
41 Garrett: Madam Chair. Is there, is there a provision, I, I understand what the  
42 emphasis is and I agree with that. What I'm interested in is how we deal  
43 with the exceptions and that's, that's really what I'm trying to address is, is  
44 that if there's not a way of explicitly saying in the plan that special projects  
45 for new roads or for inclusion of new roads in the state system would be  
46 considered based on X criteria or something like that. I think that it's, it's

1 important to recognize the potential for that kind of change and, and to do  
2 it as the exception. That's fine because I think the, the point is we got to  
3 take care of what we've got and we got to build those, those connections  
4 and connect our communities and all that sort of stuff but I think otherwise  
5 there's too much of a possibility as the plan is applied to misunderstand  
6 what the intent was and that it was okay to have some new roads or to  
7 make some changes in the state system. So I just, I, I think that that's a,  
8 that's really important for us and I'll work something out in terms of making  
9 sure that we get comments in.

10  
11 Herrera: Okay great. Thanks.

12  
13 Garrett: Thank, and thank you for your clarification.

14  
15 Herrera: Thanks.

16  
17 Sorg: Yeah.

18  
19 Flores: Anyone else? Commissioner, or Councilor Sorg.

20  
21 Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. Very good presentation by the way. This is  
22 something that some of us here on the Board here have, were part of as  
23 we started out and it's really good to see that it's coming to an end and  
24 there's going to be some real good documents to go forward on. And  
25 Commissioner Garrett thank you for bringing all that up, that was good,  
26 looking at possibilities of new ways, new things. That's good and we keep  
27 that in mind. I, although I didn't see in your presentation the word "choice"  
28 but I think you had it there throughout and that's what I'm kind of, one of  
29 the many things I'd like to emphasize is providing choices for our, our  
30 people to get from point A to point B, to go where they need to go. If you  
31 want to go from Las Cruces to Albuquerque, be nice to have a couple  
32 three different choices of getting there, flying there or taking a train or, or  
33 driving on the highway. But that's on, on a large scale but on something  
34 smaller and we try to do this in the city is provide choices with your  
35 walking, your biking, and transit, public transit, and, and then it's of course  
36 your own private vehicles. I, I, I was thinking as you were saying there of  
37 my own individual case. I'm lucky because there's one, well there's more  
38 than one but one main store that I, I can do, travel there or get there by  
39 three different ways and I've used all three. I can walk to it, I can bike my,  
40 ride my bike, and I can drive over there. It all depends on the weather and  
41 how much time I have and so those are the kind of things that you know  
42 people like to have and so I, that's what I like to encourage as we go  
43 forward: Provide as many choices as we can economically provide.  
44 Thank you Madam Chair.

45

1 Flores: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Thank you very much for your  
2 presentation.

3  
4 Herrera: Thanks.

5  
6 **7.2 NMDOT update**

7  
8 Flores: And we'll move on to 7.2, New Mexico DOT update.

9  
10 Doolittle: Thank you Madam Chair. I just want to give, a lot of the projects that were  
11 listed under that agenda item I touched on last month but I'll go through  
12 them again real quickly. The first one, the I-10 mill and inlay from 146 to  
13 164 we already talked a little bit about as part of the TIP. That one is  
14 currently scheduled. I would expect that you'll see some construction  
15 around spring of 2016. It's not scheduled to be bid until the end of the  
16 year but with our weather we'll just have to wait and see what happens as  
17 we get closer to that time. Second one on the list is the Union bridge  
18 replacement project. That one is currently still in a ramp-up, that one is  
19 currently still in a ramp-up/  
20

21 Murphy: Sorry, am trying to get to the

22  
23 Doolittle: Contractors still mobilizing in. I would expect that we'll start seeing some  
24 construction around the end of June. Again that will impact the Union, the  
25 city street underneath and I-10 over the top but again as we get closer to  
26 the project I'll start preparing schedules for more detailed discussion at  
27 these meetings. Third project on the list is the Missouri bridge. Those of  
28 you that have been through there, that contractor is working very quickly.  
29 Still we're happy with their progress. They're still working on the  
30 southbound lanes. Goal is still to be finished by Christmas so as, as we  
31 move forward I'll let you know when we get ready to switch traffic but at  
32 this point they'll continue to work on the southbound lanes. We have had  
33 a few closures on Missouri itself but I think our PIO office is doing a real  
34 good job getting those notices out to try to limit the inconveniences to the  
35 public. They're all at night so we're really trying but I've been real happy  
36 with that contractor and their progress on that project. The next one is the  
37 I-10, 133 to the 146. That is basically from Corralitos to the I-10/I-25  
38 interchange. That one is scheduled for an August letting. We may see  
39 some work towards the end of the fall depending again on weather. The  
40 one thing I will, I would like to share with you is we recognize that there'll  
41 be some conflicts in scheduling time between that one and the Union  
42 bridge project. We actually put a note in the contract that will be no  
43 conflicts with the traffic control. We're going to require them to do all of  
44 the work basically from Corralitos as you're coming into town probably  
45 until about Motel, maybe as far as Avenida de Mesilla and then once the  
46 Union bridge finishes then they can pick up that last section up to the I-

1 10/I-25 interchange so we'll do everything we can to make sure that  
2 there's not confusion or conflicts between those two projects.

3 No, that's the Union there next to the university and the, the,  
4 underneath it's the Las Cruces, Union Road underpass, correct. So that,  
5 that whole interchange and on-ramp there's the one that we'll be doing as  
6 part of that project. The last one that we have on there is NM188 and I  
7 think Councilor Small did a really good job giving us a quick update on  
8 what's going on with that one and continue through the, through the study  
9 phase and the design phase. As we work through that I'll provide updates  
10 on that one as well. With that, that's really all the projects we have in the  
11 area. Does anybody have any questions or comments for me? I will take  
12 them now.

13  
14 Flores: Councilor Sorg.

15  
16 Sorg: Thank you Madam Chair. Thanks for the background music. Oh, I, I see  
17 a problem coming with the Missouri bridge project once football season  
18 starts. Is there any plans to mitigate the heavy traffic on I-25 for football  
19 games?  
20

21 Doolittle: Councilor Sorg at this point the only thing that we stipulated through this  
22 entire project is that the southbound lanes will remain to two at all times.  
23

24 Sorg: Oh.  
25

26 Doolittle: Luckily you know if we can get, and that's kind of the reason that we  
27 started on the southbound lanes. If they can get that section built we'll  
28 actually have a wider bridge, the auxiliary lane will be in place so we'll  
29 have better access to the University interchange than we do right now.  
30

31 Sorg: Good.  
32

33 Doolittle: So hopefully we can get that project finished up. I'll work on trying to get  
34 some, some specific updates of when they plan on switching traffic but the  
35 way they're going right now we should be on the southbound lanes before  
36 school starts.  
37

38 Sorg: Okay, very good. Thank you. That's, that's good to know. And that's all  
39 Madam Chair.  
40

41 Flores: Thank you. Anyone else? All right.  
42

43 **7.3 Committee Training**  
44

45 Flores: So moving on to committee training.  
46

1 Murphy: Okay Madam Chair and I apologize for the brief, as we're trying to cue it  
2 up. We had, had a couple of heavy items here on the agenda so we  
3 thought we'd lighten it up but tie it together with, with the training. Some of  
4 you've probably seen it but I'm going to go ahead and play this committee  
5 training, that's committee training.  
6

7 VIDEO PLAYED.  
8

9 Murphy: So if they could make infrastructure exciting, we could make meetings fun.

10  
11 Flores: All right.  
12

13 **8. COMMITTEE AND STAFF COMMENTS**  
14

15 Flores: Committee and staff comments.  
16

17 Sorg: So that's part of our training?  
18

19 Flores: Was training done? Sorry.  
20

21 Murphy: That, that was the training. It tied the state transportation plan and the  
22 MPO transportation plan together.  
23

24 Flores: Thank you.  
25

26 Murphy: We have a, a public, a public meeting coming up on our University Avenue  
27 corridor. I'm going to go ahead and pass out the flyers for that. This is the  
28 Phase A study that we have Bohannon Huston under contract for to look  
29 at bicycle/pedestrian improvements on University Avenue from Main to  
30 Highway 28. The meeting's going to be at the Mesilla Community Center  
31 on, a week from tomorrow from 6:30 to 8.  
32

33 Small: Madam Chair.  
34

35 Flores: Councilor Small.  
36

37 Small: Thank you Madam Chair and sorry, thank you very much Mr. Murphy. Do  
38 we know if any roundabouts are proposed, are going to be a part of this  
39 topic even in, in small, it, it might not necessarily be appropriate but I know  
40 again complimenting DOT and, and Molzen Corbin and folks for at least  
41 considering even for the Valley Drive/Highway 188 project. It, it seems  
42 important that we take every opportunity to look at, especially when  
43 something is focused on pedestrian and bicycle improvements that we  
44 consider how innovative design can impact that.  
45

1 Murphy: Madam Chair, Councilor Small. I think they're at, the consultants at the  
2 initial gathering of information. That's not something that I've been aware  
3 that's been suggested to be looked at but that's certainly something we  
4 can ask them to look at.  
5  
6 Small: I'd, I'd be very appreciative. Thank you very much. Thank, thank you  
7 Madam Chair.  
8  
9 Flores: Okay. Anyone else?  
10  
11 Barraza: Madam Chair.  
12  
13 Flores: Mayor Barraza.  
14  
15 Barraza: Have these flyers already gone out Tom?  
16  
17 Murphy: Madam Chair, Mayor Barraza. We published these in the, it, it was  
18 published in the Sun News on Saturday. We were planning on doing  
19 another publication on I think, I think either next Tuesday or next  
20 Wednesday. They haven't figured out which day's going to be  
21 strategically the best. And we've sent them out to our master mailing list.  
22 I, I think I'm also going to be disseminating them to the public information  
23 officers through, for each of the governments.  
24  
25 Barraza: Okay, thank you. And just one correction, on the location at the  
26 Community Center it's Mesilla, NM not Las Cruces.  
27  
28 Murphy: Oh. My apologies. I did not catch.  
29  
30 Barraza: Yeah. And we also will go ahead and post at our regular meeting places  
31 that we do our postings, excuse me and on our website also, so.  
32  
33 Murphy: And it's, it'll be on the MPO website as well.  
34  
35 Barraza: Okay. Very good. Thank you.  
36  
37 Flores: Thank you.  
38  
39 Murphy: And then the last staff comment, we passed out the, we got the update for  
40 the bicycle suitability map. We've passed it out to bike stores, to all the  
41 governments, and we've ordered plenty if you know of anybody that, that  
42 can use some to, to pass out more but we're, it was, staff, staff worked  
43 hard with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. We had a  
44 couple of intern, or student co-ops from NMSU that also worked very, very  
45 diligently on this and I, and they kept me out of it so it looks nice. They did  
46 a great job.



1  
2 Flores: Did. It looks good. I already swiped an extra one.  
3  
4 Doolittle: Madam Chair.  
5  
6 Flores: Mr. Doolittle.  
7  
8 Doolittle: Real quick Tom on that, is, is, is this electronic at all? The reason I'm  
9 asking is Representative Gomez has been very active with some of the,  
10 he's had some bicycle issues and concerns and I would like to find a way  
11 to either mail him a copy or have this electronically so that it can be e-  
12 mailed out to him but that is certainly somebody I'd like to get it some way  
13 shape or form a copy of this to him.  
14  
15 Murphy: I'm not sure if, if we've gotten around to it but we do have a, it, we should  
16 have it on our website to download or we could send you the, the pdf ...  
17  
18 Doolittle: Okay.  
19  
20 Murphy: By e-mail.  
21  
22 Doolittle: Either, either way and I'll make sure that it gets to Representative Gomez.  
23 Thank you. That, that would be greatly appreciated.  
24  
25 Flores: Okay. Anyone else? Do we have any committee comments? Okay,  
26 seeing none.  
27

28 **9. PUBLIC COMMENT**

29  
30 Flores: We'll move on to public comment. Is there anyone in the public that would  
31 like to make a comment? Seeing none.  
32

33 **10. ADJOURNMENT (2:45 p.m.)**

34  
35 Flores: We'll move on to adjournment. Is that, did you have a comment? Oh, a  
36 motion.  
37

38 Pedroza: Make a motion that we adjourn.  
39

40 Flores: Okay. Do I have a second? Second by Councilor Small. Thank you.  
41 We're adjourned. We're all in favor.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



# METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004  
 PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155  
<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

## MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE ACTION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 12, 2015

**AGENDA ITEM:**

6.1 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Review and approval by the MPO Policy Committee

**SUPPORT INFORMATION:**

2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Report  
 Two Emails from Jolene Herrera, NMDOT Planner

**DISCUSSION:**

On June 10, 2015, the MPO Policy Committee approved the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The following amendment(s) to the TIP have been requested:

CN	FY	Agency	Project & Termini	Scope	Change
LC00110	2016/2017	Doña Ana County	El Camino Real Rd At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road	Design & Construction for Intersection Realignment	Add \$42,746 per revised estimate by DAC (\$3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)
LC00240	2016-2017	NMDOT	US 70 / MP 162 – 170, San Augustine Pass	Shoulder Widening	\$350K PE in FY 2016/FY2017 Construction
LC00250	2016/2018/2019	NMDOT	University Ave & Triviz / I-25 Interchange	Bridge Replacement & Interchange Modifications	Adding \$1.2M in FY2016 for PE
LC00270	2016	NMDOT	US 70 / MP 149.5 – 150.8 – Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange	Capacity and Safety Study	New project, planning phase using State Road Fund

1100820	2016	NMDOT	West Mesa Road From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time	Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document	New project phase using State Road Fund
LC00230	2020	NMDOT	Various RR Crossings	Signal Upgrades	Moved to FY 2020 from FY 2018

These amendments will not affect any other projects currently listed in the TIP.

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**RESOLUTION NO. 15-09**

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2016-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.**

The Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Committee is informed that:

**WHEREAS**, preparation of a financially constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a requirement of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) (U.S.C. 23 § 450.324) ; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is responsible for the planning and financial reporting of all federally funded and regionally significant transportation-related projects within the MPO Area for the specified fiscal years; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee adopted the FY 2016-2021 TIP on June 10, 2015; and

**WHEREAS**, the NMDOT has requested amendments to the FY 2016-2021 TIP; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its July 21, 2015 meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed and recommended approval of these amendments at its August 6, 2015 meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Committee has determined that it is in the best interest of the MPO for the Resolution amending the FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program to be approved.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the Policy Committee of the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization:

**(I)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Fiscal Year 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program is amended as shown in Exhibit “A”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution.

**(II)**

**THAT** the Mesilla Valley MPO’s Self-Certification, as contained in Exhibit “B”, attached hereto and made part of this resolution is hereby approved

**(III)**

**THAT** staff is directed to take appropriate and legal actions to implement this Resolution.

**DONE** and **APPROVED** this 12th day of August , 2015.

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_

Chair

Motion By:	
Second By:	
VOTE:	
Chair Flores	
Vice Chair Sorg	
Councillor Pedroza	
Councillor Small	
Commissioner Garrett	
Commissioner Hancock	
Commissioner Duarte-Benavidez	
Mayor Barraza	
Trustee Bernal	
Mr. Doolittle	

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

Recording Secretary

---

City Attorney

**FY2016-FY2019 TIP Exhibit "A"**

<b>CN</b>	<b>FY</b>	<b>Route</b>	<b>Termini</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>Funds listed on TIP</b>	<b>Project total</b>	<b>Change</b>
LC00110	2016/2017	El Camino Real Rd	At Intersection of Dona Ana School Road	Design & Construction for Intersection Realignment	\$474,519	\$517,265	Add \$42,746 per revised estimate by DAC (\$3,500 in FY2016 for ROW)
LC00120	2016	US 70	MP 149.2-149.5, Intersection of Spitz, Solano, Three Crosses	Intersection Realignment & Improvements	\$5,450,000	\$5,450,000	No change
LC00140	2017	US 70	MP 146.4 - 146.6, Intersection with 17th St	Install new Traffic Signal and Intersection Improvements	\$800,000	\$800,000	No change
LC00160	2017	NM 188 (Valley Drive)	MP 1 - 3, Picacho to Avenida De Mesilla.	Roadway Reconstruction. Includes Avenida De Mesilla from Valley to Hickory	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000	No change
LC00230	2018	Various	Various RR Crossings in CLC	Signal Upgrades at various RR crossings	\$550,000	\$550,000	No change
LC00240	2016/2017	US 70	MP 162 - 170, San Augustin Pass	Shoulder Widening	\$4,362,000	\$4,362,000	\$350K PE in FY2016/Construction in FY2017
LC00250	2016/2018/ 2019	University Avenue & Triviz	Interchange with I-25	Bridge Replacement & Interchange Modifications	\$25,000,000	\$26,200,000	Added \$1.2M in FY2016 for PE
LC00270	2016	US 70	MP 149.5 - 150.8 Spitz/Solano to I-25 Interchange	Capacity and Safety Study	\$0	\$1,500,000	New project, planning phase using State Road Fund.
1100820	2016	West Mesa Road	From near NM 136 to I-10, Exact termini unknown at this time	Phases 1C-1D to complete alternatives analysis and environmental document	\$0	\$425,000	New project phase using State Road Fund.
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$50,804,265</b>	





**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**  
SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004  
PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155  
<http://mvmmpo.las-cruces.org>

**Resolution 15-09 Exhibit “B”**

**MESILLA VALLEY MPO SELF-CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 450.334, the New Mexico Department of Transportation, and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Las Cruces urbanized area hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

- (1) 49 U.S.C. 5323(l), 23 U.S.C. 135, and 23 U.S.C. 450.220;
- (2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;
- (3) Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Pub. L. 105-178) regarding the involvement of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded planning projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2100; 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 26);
- (4) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and U. S. DOT implementing regulation;
- (5) The provision of 49 U.S.C. Part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities; and
- (6) Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d)).

**POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR**

**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**NMDOT**

**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**From:** Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 13, 2015 9:50 AM  
**To:** Andrew Wray  
**Cc:** Tom Murphy  
**Subject:** Amendments to FY2016-FY2021 TIP  
**Attachments:** FY2016-FY2019 TIP-Revised.xls

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good morning Andrew,

Can you please include this email and the attachment in the upcoming BPAC, TAC, and PC meeting packets along with an action item on each agenda? I will be available at all three meetings to answer any questions the committees may have.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

**Jolene Herrera**  
**Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2**  
**NMDOT South Region Design**  
**750 N Solano Dr**  
**Las Cruces, NM 88001**  
**O: (575) 525-7358**  
**C: (575) 202-4698**

**From:** Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT <JoleneM.Herrera@state.nm.us>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 21, 2015 3:07 PM  
**To:** Andrew Wray  
**Subject:** FW: Section 130 Program - TIP/STIP Change within MVMPO for Next Amendment

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi Andrew,

I just received this email this afternoon. Do you think it would be appropriate to do a floor amendment at the BPAC tonight with this new information?

Thanks,

**Jolene Herrera**  
**Urban & Regional Planner D1 & D2**  
**NMDOT South Region Design**  
**750 N Solano Dr**  
**Las Cruces, NM 88001**  
**O: (575) 525-7358**  
**C: (575) 202-4698**

---

**From:** Craven, William, NMDOT  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 21, 2015 2:07 PM  
**To:** Herrera, Jolene M, NMDOT  
**Cc:** Maes, Rebecca, NMDOT; Fine, Robert, NMDOT  
**Subject:** Section 130 Program - TIP/STIP Change within MVMPO for Next Amendment

Jolene,

I'm not sure what the MVMPO deadline is for getting changes into the TIP for the next Amendment, but there's one change that needs to be made within the MVMPO region in that update.

CN LC00230, Signal Upgrades at Various RR Crossings, needs to move from year 2018 to year 2020 (the planning year) in the next update. No changes in the budget are required.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions on this.

Thanks,  
Bill

**Bill Craven**

Rail Bureau Manager

New Mexico Department of Transportation

(505) 827-5263

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



# **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
POLICY COMMITTEE  
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 12, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:**

7.1 NMDOT Projects Update

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Update from NMDOT regarding current projects

**DISCUSSION:**

1100620 – I-10 Mill and Inlay Project, MP 146-164.3

1100830 – I-10 Bridge Replacement Project (Union)

LC00100 – I-25 Bridge Replacement Project (Missouri)

LC00150 – I-10 Pavement Preservation Project, MP 133-146

LC00160 – NM 188 (Valley Drive) Reconstruction Project

LC00210 – Goathill Road RR Crossing Project

LC00220 – NM 226 RR Crossing Project

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



# **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

SERVING LAS CRUCES, DOÑA ANA COUNTY, AND MESILLA

P.O. BOX 20000 | LAS CRUCES NM | 88004

PHONE (575) 528-3222 | FAX (575) 528-3155

<http://mvmpo.las-cruces.org>

**MESILLA VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
POLICY COMMITTEE  
DISCUSSION FORM FOR THE MEETING OF August 12, 2015**

**AGENDA ITEM:**

7.2 Taylor Road Functional Classification Discussion

**DISCUSSION:**

MPO Staff will present on the MPO's role in the development and implementation of the regional Functional Classification system.